

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action mailed January 10, 2008 (hereinafter "Office Action"), claims 27, 29, 32, 36, 37, 39, 40, 42, and 43 have been amended. Claim 46 has been newly added. Therefore, claims 27-46 are pending. Support for the instant amendments is provided throughout the as-filed Specification. Thus, no new matter has been added. In view of the foregoing amendments and following comments, allowance of all the claims pending in the application is respectfully requested.

INTERVIEW SUMMARY

Examiner Kristie D. Shingles is thanked for the courtesies extended to Applicants' representative during telephonic interviews conducted on February 6 and April 8, 2008. During the telephonic interview of February 6, 2008, differences between Applicants' invention and relied upon reference (U.S. Patent No. 6,941,105) were discussed. Specifically, Applicants' representative identified features of Applicants' pending claims that are not disclosed by the relied upon reference, thereby rendering the 35 U.S.C. §102(e) rejection with respect to Applicants' pending claims improper. Further, it was noted that, though Applicants' pending claims have not been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 in this Office Action, if such a rejection was to be made in a subsequent Office Action, Applicants can overcome this rejection as well.

During the telephonic interview of April 8, 2008, the Examiner provided suggestions regarding possible claim amendments, which Applicants' representative mentioned that they might consider. At this time, Applicants have not amended claims 27-45 to incorporate the features suggested by the Examiner, however, have added claim 46 which incorporates the suggested features.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Examiner has rejected claims 27, 29-40, and 42-45 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,941,105 to Rowley et al. ("Rowley"). Applicants traverse this rejection for *at least* the reason that Rowley neither explicitly nor impliedly discloses each of the features of Applicants' pending claims.

Independent claim 27, for example, includes several recitations pertaining to operations for *remotely* performing exercises:

A computer implemented method for enabling a plurality of users at a plurality of respective client systems to *remotely perform one or more respective exercises using the plurality of respective client systems*, the method comprising:

...
receiving a request to *connect to a remote system* from at least one user;

accessing, *by the remote system*, the course database to determine one or more courses associated with the user;

transmitting, *by the remote system*, a list of the courses associated with the user *to the respective client system* associated with the user;

receiving, *by the remote system*, a selection of at least one of the courses in the course list from the user;

accessing, *by the remote system*, the course database to determine one or more exercises associated with the selected course;

transmitting, *by the remote system*, a list of the exercises associated with the selected course *to the respective client system* associated with the user;

receiving, *by the remote system*, a selection of at least one of the exercises in the transmitted exercise list from the user;

accessing, *by the remote system*, the course database to determine at least one virtual machine associated with the selected exercise;

launching, *by the remote system*, the virtual machine associated with the selected exercise, wherein the launched virtual machine generates a user interface for performing the selected exercise; and

transmitting, *by the remote system*, a view of the user interface *to the respective client system* associated with the user, wherein the user *performs the selected exercise by remotely interacting with the virtual machine via the view of the user interface*.

Rowley, by contrast, discloses a system and method for configuring a *standalone classroom computer* for use in the IT classroom. The classroom computer is configured to *enable a student to perform an exercise using only the standalone classroom computer*, as the classroom computer can execute multiple virtual machines concurrently. If multiple students want to perform exercises, multiple classroom computers would need to be configured by the instructor.

Per various embodiments of Applicants' invention, client systems used by users to remotely perform exercises do not require elaborate configuration by the instructor. In order to perform the exercise remotely, the client systems utilize a web browser and a viewer application that displays a view of a user interface generated by a virtual machine launched by the remote system (as recited in Applicants' claim 2, for example). Since, Applicants' client systems do not comprise virtual machine platforms or virtual machines, the client systems do not require elaborate configuration by the instructor.

As such, Rowley clearly discloses a *standalone classroom computer* which is configured to enable the student to perform an exercise, and fails to disclose a system and method wherein a user connects to a remote system using his respective client system to *remotely perform an exercise by interacting with at least one virtual machine via a view of a user interface generated by the virtual machine*. Moreover, Rowley fails to disclose that various operations involved in performing an exercise are performed by the remote system.

Furthermore, Rowley discloses that the exercise loader software module (ELSM) *included in the standalone classroom computer* accesses the classroom database to determine

the names of courses available to the student. Specifically, the ELSM determines the courses that have been installed on the classroom computer and displays those course names to the student (See column 2, lines 64-66; and column 6, lines 35-38). By contrast, per various embodiments of Applicants' invention, the course database is accessed to determine one or more courses that are *associated with the user*.

For at least the above-mentioned reasons, Rowley fails to disclose all the features of Applicants' claim 27. As such, claim 27 is clearly patentable. Claims 32, 36, and 42 include features similar to those set forth in claim 27. Thus, these claims are patentable for at least the same reasons given relative to claim 27. Thus the rejection is improper and should be withdrawn. Claims 29-31, 33-35, 37-40, and 43-45 depend from and add features to one of claims 27, 32, 36, and 42, rejections of these claims are likewise improper and should be withdrawn.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner has rejected claims 28 and 41 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Rowley in view of U.S. Patent Application No. 2002/0103882 to Johnston et al. ("Johnston"). Applicants traverse this rejection for *at least* the reason that the Examiner has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness. Claims 28 and 41 depend from and add features to patentable claims 27 and 36. Thus, rejections of these claims are improper and should be withdrawn.

NEWLY ADDED CLAIM 46

As mentioned above, claim 46 incorporates the suggestions provided by the Examiner during the telephonic interview. As such, claim 46 is allowable.

CONCLUSION

Having addressed each of the foregoing rejections, it is respectfully submitted that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the application is in condition for allowance. Notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Date: April 10, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By: Nidhi Chotani
Nidhi Chotani
Registration No. 59,924

PILLSBURY WINTHROP SHAW PITTMAN LLP
P.O. Box 10500
McLean, Virginia 22102
Main: 703-770-7900
Direct: 703-770-7529
Fax: 703-770-7901